



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

No less lucid is the exposition of the divergency in the courses of English and American Puritanism. The early Puritans held that right, the "obligation sanctioned by duty and by ideal justice, springing from the heavens above," should not be opposed by rights, the "privileges and duties assured mankind by the human laws under which they live;" and a small band of them emigrated to America where right and rights should agree. This act and "the still vital historical growth which has sprung from that seed"⁵ were the great expression of Elizabethan Puritanism. Here we see the ancestral oneness of England and America. In America the idea persisted that human rights should be controlled by Divine right, but in England after the turbulence of the civil wars it was realized that "in rights lay the true safety of the nation." This divergence in thought partly accounts for the inability of the Americans in 1775 to see any authority in Parliament, since this authority was the natural expression of human rights.

Milton's relation to the temper of the century forms the basis of the treatment of the great Puritan poet. His early work relates him to the divergent masters of lyric poetry, Spenser, Jonson, and Donne. Soon, however, he began to assert his own mastery, and as he did so he became a being solitary and apart. His is the "inevitable solitude of his disintegrating time." In his political and prose work he was an illustrious type of the Puritans who sought to control rights by right, but his own opinions, which he regarded as those of the elect, he could not force upon the unelect, and so as a reformer he ended in failure. In his great poems he is more than ever solitary; he is the "one true poet of the national disintegration of England."

Professor Wendell is nothing if not suggestive. He notes Jonson's remarkable visualizing powers, and shows how these manifest themselves in his plays, so that as a dramatist he is to be regarded not as a poet but as a painter. Again, he seeks to account for our impression of Pepys as a rather elderly person when he wrote his Diary, by showing him to belong partly to an age that has past and partly to the present, so that he seems like a garrulous grandfather. Ingenious this is, but not convincing.

There are certain occasions when Professor Wendell's English makes us sit up with amazement. In one place he says:—"Except, of course, that novelties go out of fashion almost as swiftly as they come into the same."⁶ The pun, let us hope, is unconscious in—"You feel in the lines . . . an elaboration of overstrained metaphor wherein Donne, though not exactly imitated, is clean out

done."⁷ "Harshening stanzas"⁸ makes us grit our teeth, and "none of them seem precisely the most typical man of their time"⁹ is remarkable grammar. The frequency with which favorite words appear, such as 'crescent,' 'pristine,' 'immutable,' 'ecstatic,' 'exacerbation,' and, of course, 'integral,' with its derivatives, does at times weigh upon one's soul. "Keat's"¹⁰ and "Pepys's"¹¹ are misprints for which any author might wish the printer hanged.

JAMES W. TUPPER.

Philadelphia, Pa.

SOME RECENT STUDIES OF *La Tía Fingida*.

About the year 1606 the Cardinal-Archbishop of Seville received from one of his clergy, Don Francisco Porras de la Cámara, a manuscript collection of diverting miscellany that had recently been going the rounds of the city; the gift comprised nine documents, the first six being witty odds and ends, partly by Porras and partly of his editing, duly credited. But the three pieces concluding the collection were three anonymous *novelas*; the first in order was *La Tía Fingida*, second *Rinconete y Cortadillo*, third *El Zeloso Estremeño*. The last two were published by Cervantes a few years later (1613) with his other *Novelas Ejemplares*. Thus of all the Porras collection the only piece remaining unaccredited and unclaimed was *La Tía*, slipped in between the six Porras miscellanies and two of Cervantes' *novelas*.

The plot of *La Tía* is as follows:

Doña Claudia, a second Celestina, is the putative aunt of pretty Esperanza, whom she has several times sold for what she is not, being herself thorough in the wiles of pandery. The pair arrive in Salamanca with all outward respectability, taking a house in a disreputable street. The incongruity attracts the curiosity of two university students, who quickly divine the situation and with their fellows give Esperanza a serenade. Incited by the repulse of an instructed serving-maid, they plan another way to gain entrance, resorting to Don Felix, a type of gilded youth for whom Doña Claudia lies in wait. Suitably bribed, the maid lets Don Felix secretly into Esperanza's bedroom, where he overhears the two women in earnest dialogue, in which are cunning characterizations of Spanish provincials and a salacious exposition of Doña Claudia's craft. In the midst of this Don Felix is betrayed by a sneeze; discovery and a wordy tilt ensue. The two students slip in with the aroused patrol, who arrest the women and march them jailward. Running ahead, the students with their fellows surprise the police, rescue Esperanza and escape. In quarreling for first

⁵ P. 235.

⁶ P. 20.

⁷ P. 276.

¹⁰ P. 59.

⁸ P. 209.

¹¹ P. 331.

⁹ P. 146.

possession of the girl, one finally declares he will marry her; she consents and the other departs. The pair find a lodging and next morning leave for the student's home, where the youth tells his father a plausible tale of Esperanza's high birth, obtains the parental blessing and marries her. The bride proves a dutiful daughter-in-law, and although the facts come out, the old gentleman remains well content. Doña Claudia is thrown into jail and, being accused of witchcraft, gets a flogging besides. And here the tale ends.

From the time the Porras ms. amused the Archbishop it is almost two centuries to the beginning of its short modern career in 1788, when it was found in Madrid by the eminent scholar Bosarte, who barely mentions *La Tía* in announcing his discovery. Presently Bosarte published *Rinconete* and *El Zeloso*. He did not here mention *La Tía*, but later began to prepare it for the press, and not till then, apparently, was he convinced that Cervantes wrote this tale also. He expected, it seems, to prove the same by comparisons "tomadas de las demás obras de Cervantes," as his friend Arrieta quotes him, "y que son idénticas con otras que se registran en la presente novela." But he died without completing his project, leaving to Arrieta such materials as he had. This literary heir proved profligate, however, and although he printed the *Tía* in 1814, he made no use of Bosarte's memorandum, saying in the preface that he could prove Cervantes' authorship "pero esto sería hacer bien poco favor al discernimiento del lector." Arrieta's temerity went farther, and he made two large cuts from the dialogue between Doña Claudia and Esperanza, besides frequently altering the text elsewhere as his taste dictated.

When the Arrieta edition had appeared, and its mutilations were remarked, the German scholars Wolf and Franceson decided to print a faithful text; this they did, at Berlin, 1818, having obtained their copy from the distinguished cervantist Navarrete.¹ The Porras codex now went astray, but ere long was found by another ardent cervantist, Gallardo, but only again to be lost and forever, in the course of the insurrectionary atrocities of 1823. Gallardo, however, had studied *La Tía*, carefully comparing the ms. with the two published texts, the Columbine ms.² and with Cervantes' works. Hence he published a paper (the first number of his *Crítico*, 1835) declaring, even more strongly than Arrieta, that Cervantes wrote the story. This opinion had already been adopted by the publishers of Cervantes, for in 1821 a Madrid edition of the *Novelas Ejemplares* appeared

containing *La Tía*. Since then until recently the practice and the theory have been uniform, save for a few sporadic dissents, to be mentioned.

The first effort to discredit a century of say-so is the highly admirable study by M. Foulché-Delbosc, *Étude sur La Tía Fingida*.³ Here is given for the first time a complete, concise and clear history of the tale and its criticism, or lack of it. The accompanying comment is spirited but well within the bounds of fairness; no theory is advanced and it is sought merely to show that all the strenuous briefs for Cervantes are unintelligent, proving nothing but ardent admiration for a great genius. The following are salient points of M. Foulché-Delbosc's study:

As to Bosarte his critical method is variously shown, including a full presentation of his letter written to *El Diario* on discovering the codex. Arrieta's attempts at criticism, and his remarks as to source of his copy are shown by his own words to be hopelessly self-contradictory. The mutilations of the text are declared to be Arrieta's own and not Bosarte's work, and Arrieta's minor alterations are shown to number two hundred and eighty, and to be puerile and unwarranted. Rosell is sharply criticised for his clumsy preparation of the text (Arrieta's 2d edition) for the Rivadeneyra edition. Gallardo is freely quoted; "in place of impartial investigation there is only foolish invective" in his words. It is impossible here to present adequately M. Foulché-Delbosc's deft confrontation of blunders and rhetorical flights; he thus concludes of the whole body of this criticism:

"Rarement controverse littéraire fut discutée avec un plus évident parti-pris et un sans-gêne plus absolu pour l'opinion d'autrui. . . . Il est probable que Bosarte conçut l'idée d'attribuer *La Tía* à Cervantes parce qu'elle se trouvait dans le même manuscrit que *Rinconete y Cortadillo* et *El Celoso Extremeno*: les ressemblances de style, l'air de famille et autres pseudo-preuves ne vinrent qu'ensuite. Une telle déduction est inacceptable: le fait qu'un même manuscrit contient trois Nouvelles et que l'on connaît l'auteur de deux d'entre elles n'implique nullement que la troisième soit du même auteur que les deux autres. C'est pourtant cette théorie qui a prévalu dans le cas. . . . Quant aux ressemblances, quant aux analogies de phrases ou de locutions, il est toujours aisé d'en trouver avec un peu de savoir-faire et beaucoup de bonne volonté. . . . Mais ces sortes de rapprochements ne sauraient tenir lieu de preuves, d'autant qu'il serait aisé d'en établir d'autres pour soutenir la thèse contraire. . . . Ces rapprochements. . . . ont-ils du moins été tentés pour *La Tía Fingida*? Même pas. . . . L'idée que *La Tía* est de Cervantes est profondément enracinée chez les cervantolâtres. . . . *La Tía Fingida* est-elle ou n'est-elle pas de Cervantes? Tant que l'on ne disposera pas d'autres éléments de discussion que ceux dont on s'est servi jusqu'ici, la question ne pourra être résolue ni par l'affirmative ni par la négative. . . . Il est sage de professer parfois un agnosticisme résigné."⁴

¹ *La Tía Fingida. Novela inédita de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra*. This edition, and one printed from it in 1842 at Madrid, both very rare, are the only ones in which the Porras text still exists.

² The Columbine ms. of *La Tía*, an incomplete one, is still preserved at Sevilla, and its text is that printed in the Rivadeneyra *Cervantes*. The date of this ms., though unsettled, is known to be too late to bring it into the present connection.

³ *Revue Hispanique*, iv, 1899, pp. 256-306.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 282-289.

M. Foulché-Delbosc has made it unnecessary to dwell on any but such studies as have appeared since his article. Among these is the work of Señor D. Francisco A. de Icaza,⁵ whose few words on the present subject (pp. 225-7) are here quoted almost in full.

"Con el *Coloquio de Cipión y Berganza*, quiso cerrar Cervantes la serie de sus Novelas. . . . No iba á imaginar que había de agregarse á su obra, siglos después, por los mismos que pretendían despojarle de aquellas que declaraba 'suyas propias' . . . otra novela cuya paternidad gratuitamente se le hubiera de atribuir."

The words "pretendían despojarle" etc., allude to Bosarte; and, to leave no doubt, a footnote adds, in brief, this: It is very odd that Bosarte and Estala should have suggested to Arrieta that *La Tía* belonged to Cervantes, since by precisely the same reasoning they had denied to him *Rinconete* and *El Celoso*, their reasoning being "el aparecer las novelas juntas y anónimas" in the Porras ms. In other words, Icaza accuses Bosarte of stupidly reasoning in a circle. But compare the remark of Foulché-Delbosc: "Mais il n'accuse nullement Cervantes de n'en pas être l'auteur [of *Rinconete* and *El Celoso*], comme le prétendirent plus tard sans aucune fondement Gallardo et Fernández-Guerra, qui n'ont pas compris ce qu'avait écrit Bosarte," namely, the letter to *El Diario*.⁶ Compare also his later words hereon: "Je ne suis pas de l'avis de M. de I. . . ce que Bosarte reproche à Cervantes c'est d'avoir refondu ces deux nouvelles au moment où il s'agit de les faire imprimer, et de les avoir alors 'echado á perder.' " It may be, as M. Foulché-Delbosc politely says, that Gallardo and Fernandez-Guerra "n'ont pas compris" that letter;⁸ but it would be hard for anyone to understand it as quoted by Señor Icaza (p. 60), seeing that, as the cited review observes, "M. de I. . . en omet précisément les quelques lignes qui prouvent bien que Bosarte n'accuse pas Cervantes de plagiat," namely: "Sería ligereza pensar que un hombre del talento de Miguel de Cervantes incurriese en la abominable superchería de apropiarse piezas enteras compuestas y acabadas por otros. Lo que yo más bien creería es que estas dos novelas las compuso y adornó el mismo Cervantes, sobre memorias y apuntaciones que recogería en Sevilla, y le daría algún curioso."

Señor Icaza next says:

"Ningún documento demuestra que *La Tía Fingida* sea de Cervantes. Fúndase únicamente esa suposición en pre-

⁵ *Las Novelas Ejemplares de Cervantes; sus críticos, sus modelos literarios, sus modelos vivos, y su influencia en el arte; obra premiada por el Ateneo de Madrid*. Madrid, 1901. 12mo, 279 pp.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, 259, note 5.

⁷ Review of Icaza's *Novelas Ejemplares*. *Revue Hispanique*, VIII, 551-2.

⁸ Made accessible by Foulché-Delbosc's *Étude*, 289-293.

tendidas semejanzas de estilo, apoyadas en ciertas locuciones, que el apasionado prejuicio de unos y la rutina ó ignorancia de otros han venido dando como cervantescas, cuando en realidad eran formas de expresión comunes á todos los escritores de aquel tiempo."

The supposition, in short, is based on the prejudice and ignorance of the whole Gallardo tribe. A footnote intimates, without citations, that as dissenters from the current theory "se cuenta en España D. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, y se contó en la América hispano-parlante D. Andrés Bello." The latter statement is true, as shown by Foulché-Delbosc,⁹ who cites from Amunátegui the scholar's words to Gayangos.¹⁰ But he does not cite the other authority offered by Icaza, apparently not regarding Menéndez y Pelayo as a dissenter, for he says that "en Espagne l'opinion est unanime."¹¹

Señor Icaza ends his short chapter thus:

"Los que se empeñaron en meter . . . con las Novelas . . . *La Tía* . . . no se fijaron, ó no quisieron fijarse en los giros y frases que hay en ella y que Cervantes no usó jamás. Entraría yo en esos detalles si me propusiera hacer un estudio de las obras atribuidas al autor del *Quijote*, pero sólo he querido rendir un tributo . . . á Cervantes, estudiando . . . sus *Novelas Ejemplares*."

"Entraría yo . . . pero" says Icaza, and "pudiera hacerlo . . . pero" said Arrieta. The former *pero* seems the ripper, and yet "aquí no hay pero que valga." Cervantophils will continue to ask: Who, if not Cervantes, could have written *La Tía* in view of its notable literary merit? Bello is said to have suggested Avellaneda as a possibility, but neither this hint nor any other (if any there be) has been acted on. The question is still pertinent, and Señor Icaza makes it more so by his researches, which permit him to find (pp. 231 sq.) that Spanish literature was not directly influenced by the *Exemplary Novels*, and not till long after did any one attempt to follow Cervantes in method or spirit. All the more, then, Who wrote *La Tía*?

"It must be confessed," says Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, who next takes up the discussion,¹² "that there is no external evidence to connect Cervantes with *La Tía Fingida*, and no conclusion can be

⁹ *Op. cit.*, 285; also 296. The citation is from *Vida de don Andrés Bello* by Miguel Luís Amunátegui, Santiago de Chile, 1882, pp. 575-6.

¹⁰ "No acabo de asegurarme. El motivo principal de mis dudas es la palpable diferencia que creo percibir entre el lenguaje i estilo de *La Tía Fingida* i el de las obras de Cervantes que indudablemente le pertenecen." Amunátegui is quoted as saying that Bello was inclined to credit *La Tía* to Avellaneda.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, 285.

¹² *Introduction to the Exemplary Novels* (pp. xi-xix), vol. VII of *The Complete Works of Miguel de Cervantes*. Edited by James Fitzmaurice-Kelly; translated by N. MacColl. 12 vols., Glasgow, 1902.

drawn from the internal evidence . . .” In the present light, then, “none but a very rash man would venture to assert positively that Cervantes was, or was not, the real author” of the tale. And yet “it is certainly very difficult even to suggest the name of any other contemporary who was capable of writing it.” Again, his latest remark, after once more noting the lack of evidence for Cervantes, continues: “Cependant on croirait volontiers qu’il écrivit cette admirable histoire.”¹³ It is, however, quite clear that the eminent scholar takes agnostic ground with M. Foulché-Delbosc, whose *Étude* he admiringly mentions. The cited *Introduction* disproves the report that Cervantes spoke of sending Lemos thirteen tales. The explanation of the mistake is that Salvador Fauli, publishing the *Novelas* at Valencia in 1783, omitted the Letter Dedicatory, and printed *El Curioso Impertinente* with the twelve *Novelas Ejemplares*, and under that title. Fauli then reissued his edition in 1797, restoring the dedication, but substituting “trece” for “doce.” In consequence some who have used the second edition have been misled by Fauli, all the more readily in that he supplied “an apparently specious argument in favour of assigning *La Tía Fingida* to Cervantes.” Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly touches a point on the other side of the problem, by rejecting as a quite unworthy argument “that the few loose passages in this story could not have been penned by Cervantes,” in view of his own writings, Spanish literature generally, and the moral tone of the times.

But neither the non-committal attitude of M. Foulché-Delbosc and Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, nor the attack of Señor Icaza, have daunted the followers of Gallardo, or at least not Señor D. Julián Apraiz, the beginning of whose labors in this field appears in his *Curiosidades cervantinas*,¹⁴ but being replaced by later publications is merely noted here in passing; M. Foulché-Delbosc barely mentions it, in three minor connections, and adversely. In his *Estudio histórico-crítico*,¹⁵ which, simultaneously with Señor Icaza’s essay, won the Charro-Hidalgo prize on January 26, 1901, Señor Apraiz dwells on *La Tía* at length, and credits the story to Cervantes as emphatically as his rival scorns the idea. He breaks away, however, from the time-worn vituperative method; he evolves a theory and applies it. Indeed, whether his argument be adjudged vain or not, it is still argument—

indeed the first published attempt to do, though much more elaborately, what Bosarte had in mind.

In placing *La Tía* with the *Novelas Apraiz* uses his general theory of Cervantes. With copious illustration he argues for the essential unity of Cervantes’ whole work; then, turning to the *Novelas* and severally analyzing them, he seeks to show their harmony with each other and with all of Cervantes’ writings. In upholding the thesis that these form a single organism, he notes the recurrence of identical incidents in various pieces and points out an infinity of detail possessed in common by all, but especially observes that Cervantes, almost in every instance, *treated each of his inventions in two different ways*, converting a novela, for example, into a sainete or comedy, or *vice versa*. Far from being a new idea, it was Avellaneda who “calificó de comedias á las *Novelas Ejemplares*.” Furthermore, Arrieta asked, as to *La Tía*: “¿Qué le falta para ser una hermosa comedia, sino dialogarla y suplir é intercalar algunas escenas preparatorias?”

Accordingly Señor Apraiz finds the twin-brother of *La Tía Fingida* in the entremés *El Viscaíno Fingido*. The theory is outlined in Señor Apraiz’ most recent contribution to the study of Cervantes.¹⁶ The points of his arguments follow. First, similarities of construction: title, *dramatis personae*, scene, and various features of the action (bribery of the maid, entrance of galán, entrance of officers, the ensuing row, etc.). Second, miscellaneous similarities, such as: the assumed respectability of the courtesan of each piece; both of these are from Sevilla and both refer to the university of Salamanca; the sonnet of *La Tía* is in Cervantes’ usual metre and rhyme-scheme; the dialogue between Doña Claudia and Esperanza (on ways to renew virginity and attract customers) has an “indubitable family likeness” to that of Brígida and Cristina (on the forbidding of carriages and compulsion of veils for fast women). Third, similarities of vocabulary, whereof space does not here allow a full summary of the dozen instances cited. In discussing them no attempt is made to show in *La Tía* a peculiarly cervantine use of words and phrases, unless perhaps this: “oficial vecino, pared en medio” (T. F.); “pared en medio, un platero” (V. F.).

Continuing, Apraiz makes a comparison of *La Tía* with the *Quijote*. Sancho frequently mispronounced words; the dueña in *La Tía* says “tres pringues” for “trilingüe.” Again, there are twenty-four italianisms in the *Quijote*, and at least two in the *Tía*: “pulcela” and “no que”

¹³ *Littérature Espagnole*, Paris, 1904, p. 243.

¹⁴ *Homenaje á Menéndez y Pelayo*, Madrid, 1899, I, 223-251. The portion relating to *La Tía* comprises pp. 240-251; the article is dated January, 1898.

¹⁵ *Estudio histórico-crítico sobre las Novelas Ejemplares de Cervantes*. Obra premiada por el Ateneo de Madrid. Vitoria, 1901. 8vo, 175 pp.

¹⁶ *Don Isidoro Bosarte y el centenario de La Tía Fingida*, Vitoria, 1904; 8vo, 109 pp. Reprinted, with slight additions, from the *España Moderna*, July and August, 1904.

("quince sentidos, *no que cinco*"), both occurring in the same senses in the *Quijote*.¹⁷ Sancho asks, "¿Por ventura son mis carnes de bronce?" Cf. Esperanza: "¿Soy yo por ventura de bronce? ¿No tienen sensibilidad mis carnes?" The foregoing are probably the most favorable likenesses offered. Other arguments deduced by Apraiz are the following: Doña Claudia is another Celestina, gold chain, needlecraft and all; Cervantes' delight in Celestina is well known. In the *Tía* appears a nautical proverb; Cervantes was fond of the sea. "Dozens of times" his works record his affection for Salamanca and its university, but among the twelve *Novelas* there is no exclusively Salamanican story; the *Tía* is such a one. In the redemption of Esperanza (to take a wider view) is the imagination of a genius sporadic in its age, where no similar human sympathy occurs save in the *Quijote*, the *Novelas* and—the *Tía*. On the whole, *La Tía Fingida*, according to the Spanish critic, comprises in miniature the *Quijote's* graces and freshness, its contrast of comic upper-structure and grave philosophical basis, "incólume de la indecencia y groserías rabelescas."

In winding up his argument Señor Apraiz offers these further deductions. Cervantes affirmed (prologue to the *Novelas*) that he was the author of "otras obras que andan por ahí descarriadas, y quizá sin el nombre de su dueño." This is clearly an allusion to *La Tía*. Cervantes knew of the Porras ms. presented to the *Archbishop of Seville*, because in *La Española Inglesa* the vicar asks Isabella to write out her story so that he might send it to his superior the *Archbishop of Seville*. The three novelas of the Porras ms., being grouped together and all anonymous, were all from the same hand, by the very reasoning of Father Pérez where in the *Quijote* he finds *Rinconete* and *El Curioso Impertinente* together in a valise. And finally, Cervantes habitually gave forth his stories as chronicles of fact; so *La Tía's* title affirms the tale a fact.

But supposing for the moment, says the writer, that all his labors are in vain, yet is there, he asks, no longer any such thing as prescriptive right? And how, furthermore, are we to ignore the verdicts of such a long array of scholars (mentioning about seventy), from Bosarte to the present? These questions asked, Señor Apraiz relaxes a little and facetiously orders, adjudges and decrees that Cervantes continue in pacific possession of his precious little story.

To avoid interrupting the review, Apraiz' scat-

tered mention of other writers has been postponed to this point. At the outset he says: "trataré solamente ahora de Bosarte y de *La Tía*, tanto para solemnizar el centenario de ésta como para aprovechar la ocasión de combatir las aseveraciones del Sr. D. Francisco de Icaza." He likewise comments on the fact that Icaza's statements are often lacking in proof. Of Menéndez y Pelayo, although he wrote "no poco de Cervantes y sus obras, jamás ha creído conveniente publicar (según mis noticias) esas dudas á que alude el Sr. Icaza." As to Señor Rodríguez Marín,¹⁸ "su excesiva modestia y el aplomo del Sr. Icaza . . . le hacen resignarse á admitir la posibilidad de un litigio que ya no puede sostenerse." Again, "No hacemos mención especial entre nuestros adversarios del Sr. Cotarelo, por limitarse á decir que, á su juicio, este cuento es 'de autenticidad muy dudosa';¹⁹ ni del distinguido cervantista francés Mr. Foulché-Delbosc, que cree aventurado el resolverse por la afirmativa ó la negativa." The foregoing is essentially all that Señor Apraiz says of his contemporaries; but it should be mentioned that he includes with his own partisans at least one who, as already appears, is not of them; namely, Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, whose later studies were doubtless unknown to him when he wrote.

But it should here be said that Señor Apraiz disclaims attempting a conclusive study in offering what he calls his "descosido trabajo," merely pointing out tentatively "algunos cervantismos, y aun meras analogías con otras frases cervantinas, de esta niña desheredada."

In fine, the reception of Señor Apraiz' work promises ill for future labors with the internal evidence. In spite of the meagre testimony, there are probably few stones left unturned. But after all, if one is to believe Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, no conclusion can be drawn from such evidence anyway. However, there seems to be another last chance to be taken there, in a comparison of the syntax of *La Tía* with that of Cervantes, especially in his earlier work, as Señor Apraiz believes the story to belong to that period.

Another and probably more hopeful study would be that of showing how Cervantes' residence at Salamanca would affect the question, if such residence should ever be proved. Sr. Apraiz does hardly more than mention the incongruity of Cervantes' affection for the university and frequent reference to it, with the lack of a tale exclusively Salamanican among his *novelas*.

There is little hope of finding the documents, which alone will satisfy non-partisans; nevertheless a very interesting article by Doña

¹⁷ Apraiz does not claim these terms as purely cervantine, but Foulché-Delbosc says (*op. cit.*, 298) of *pulceola* that "à ma connaissance" it is such; adding that *menjures* (not cited by Apraiz) occurs only in *La Tía* and in Garcilaso, as he thinks. But he draws no conclusion from "ces quelques rapprochements."

¹⁸ *El Loaysa del Celoso Estremeño*, Sevilla, 1901, p. 220.

¹⁹ *Revista Española*, x, 319 (May 15, 1901).

Blanca de los Ríos de Lampárez²⁰ shows that at least circumstantial evidence is not lacking. The writer does not make use of *La Tía* in presenting the testimony, confining the argument to the following. 1) The documents²¹ negatively show in Cervantes' life three and a half unrecorded years (June, 1581–December, 1584), completely blank save for one appearance in Madrid in 1583, not at all conflicting with the term-times at Salamanca. 2) In the González-Navarrete correspondence,²² the then professor of rhetoric assures Navarrete that he had seen Cervantes' name set down in the University register for a two years' course in philosophy. 3) The style and contents of *La Galatea* (1583) strongly suggest its production in an academic atmosphere. 4) Cervantes never mentions the University of Alcalá, although his first youth was spent near it; every mention he makes of students and student-life is exclusively Salaman-can. 5) In the University's records, of or about the time in question, occur student-names which figure unmodified in Cervantes. 6) The relations between Bobadilla and Cervantes probably began at Salamanca, as a study of the former's *Niñas y Pastores de Henares*, and the estrangement consequent to its appearance, seem to show.

But the point of special interest is this: Late in 1581, after an election to a certain professorship at Salamanca, appeared some lame verses by the disappointed candidate, satirizing his successful rival. This satire was included by Porras in his *Archivo de Poesías*. Four lines of it occur in the preliminary verses to the *Quixote*, and one line in the *Persiles*. In view of these facts many questions arise. How came it that some verses occasioned by a strictly Salaman-can quarrel were so familiar to Cervantes that he could aptly quote them twenty years later? Did he witness the professorial election, follow up the faculty row, and memorize or copy the satire? And then did he, on one of his numerous trips to Seville, carry a copy of the verses with him, along with other manuscript, including mayhap *La Tía*? And did he there give them to the industrious Porras; or did he lose them or leave them behind on his departure? At any rate both the bad verses and the picaresque story came into Porras' hands, and one he placed in the *Archivo de Poesías*, while the other he inserted in his gift to Niño, beside two of the *Novelas Ejemplares*.

HOMER P. EARLE.

Johns Hopkins University.

SPANISH GRAMMAR.

A Spanish Grammar, by E. C. HILLS and J. D. M. FORD. D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, 1904. ix–292 pp.

The aim of the authors is set forth in the opening sentence of the Preface: "to present to English-speaking students the more important facts of pronunciation, inflection and syntax in a clear and adequate way." The first twenty pages are devoted to general matters relating to Pronunciation, Orthography, Accentuation, etc. The letters are discussed on scientific phonetic principles with ample illustrations. The Castilian sounds are, of course, presented as the standard, but the authors also give an account of the deviations from this standard in the different parts of the Spanish-speaking world. The chapter on Accentuation deserves special mention because of its brief, but exhaustive presentation.

In the Preface the authors also state, that this grammar was prepared "with a view to facilitating the early reading of Spanish texts." Quite properly, therefore, the Verb is taken up in the very first lesson. The Present Indicative of all three conjugations is presented. The advantages of this method are obvious. The student is trained from the very beginning to exercise his faculty of discrimination by the handling of a variety of forms, and the authors are enabled to offer sensible and varied sentences from the very start. The radical-changing verbs make their appearance in lesson III,—a departure from the usual mode of presentation that cannot be too highly commended. The student thus learns at once, that such verbs as *temblar* or *dormir*, because they obey a fundamental sound-law of Spanish, are *not* irregular.

The verbs *tener* and *haber* are introduced in the same lesson (IV), and their use is set forth concisely, but exhaustively, for all practical purposes. *Ser* and *estar* are also treated in one lesson (VI), as well as the Imperfect and Preterit tenses (VIII). Such treatment is bound to develop the student's faculties of reasoning and discrimination. If each of these topics were presented in a separate lesson, the student might be tempted to use quite mechanically that particular verb or form which happens to be the subject-matter of that lesson.

In the lesson on the Comparison of Adjectives (xv) one point is particularly well brought out, viz.: that the principle of superlative formation is the addition of the definite article to the comparative (whether the comparative is formed by *más* or not). This at once explains why irregular comparatives (e. g. *mejor*, *peor*) when preceded by the article not only are real superlatives, but have practically driven out such forms as *óptimo*, *pésimo*. In fact, the authors do not even mention

²⁰ *Estudió Cervantes en Salamanca?*, in the *España Moderna*, April and May, 1899.

²¹ *Documentos cervantinos, hasta ahora inéditos, recogidos y anotados por Cristóbal Pérez Pastor*. Madrid, 1897.

²² Navarrete's *Vida*, 12 and 271.